



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/555,868	06/07/2000	JOSEF SINGER	P00.0638	2271

7590 05/28/2004

KEVIN R. SPIVAK
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
2000 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1888

EXAMINER

RYMAN, DANIEL J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2665	16

DATE MAILED: 05/28/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/555,868

Applicant(s)

SINGER, JOSEF

Examiner

Daniel J. Ryman

Art Unit

2665

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 11 May 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
- (c) ☒ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:


Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: _____.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
10. ☐ Other: _____


HUY D. VU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

Continuation of 2 and 5. NOTE: The amendments to the claims incorporate the limitations of claims 3 and 4, 7 and 8, and 16 and 17 into claims 6, 15, and 19. Claims 3, 4, 7, 8, 16, and 17 were rejected in the Final Rejection using Bharucha. By adding these limitations to the independent claims, Applicant has not placed the application in better form for appeal or materially reduced the issues for appeal. Therefore the amendments will not be entered. In addition, Applicant argues that these limitations distinguish over the prior art since "Bharucha merely discloses a known technique of using a framing bit pattern to sequence and synchronize frames". Examiner, respectfully, disagrees. The limitations of claims 3, 4, 7, 8, 16, and 17 require that a direct transmission frame generator generates position data with respect to a position of a first mini-cell for each corresponding individual transmission frame and inserts the position data into each corresponding frame. Bharucha discloses in Fig. 6 and 7 and col. 4, lines 17-22 that each frame includes a pointer that points to the position of each first mini-frame of a packet. Thus, as broadly defined, Examiner maintains that Bharucha reads on the limitations of the claims. The claims also require that the frame generator arranges the position data at the beginning of the frame. Again, Bharucha discloses in the aforementioned passages that the pointer data is inserted in the header of each frame. Thus, again, as broadly defined, Examiner maintains that Bharucha reads on the limitations of the claims. Since upon further review Examiner maintains that the rejection of the limitations found in claims 3, 4, 7, 8, 16, and 17 was proper, adding these limitations to the independent claims 6, 15, and 19 does not overcome the previous rejection.